

**OPINION 2214 (Case 3366)*****Cisseis* Gory & Laporte de Castelnau, 1839 and *Curis* Gory & Laporte de Castelnau, 1838 (Insecta, Coleoptera, BUPRESTIDAE): generic names not conserved**

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that priority is maintained for the name *Diphucrania* Dejean, 1833 and the name *Selagis* Mannerheim, 1837 for two genera of jewel beetles. Proposals to conserve the junior synonym *Cisseis* Gory & Laporte de Castelnau, 1839 of the former name and the junior synonym *Curis* Gory & Laporte de Castelnau, 1838 of the latter name were not approved.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Coleoptera; BUPRESTIDAE; *Cisseis*; *Curis*; *Diphucrania*; *Selagis*; jewel beetles.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) It is hereby ruled that the following generic names are not conserved:
  - (a) *Cisseis* Gory & Laporte de Castelnau, 1839;
  - (b) *Curis* Gory & Laporte de Castelnau, 1838.
- (2) No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.

**History of Case 3366**

An application to conserve the generic names *Cisseis* Gory & Laporte de Castelnau, 1839 and *Curis* Gory & Laporte de Castelnau, 1838 for two genera of jewel beetles, by suppressing their respective senior synonyms *Diphucrania* Dejean, 1833 and *Selagis* Mannerheim, 1837, was received from C.L. Bellamy (*California Department of Food & Agriculture, Sacramento, CA, U.S.A.*) on 28 October 2005. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 63: 247–250 (December 2006). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. A comment supporting the application was published in BZN 64: 67.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 September 2007 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 63: 248. Three Commissioners commented that there are two independent cases (conservation of the name *Cisseis*: (1a) and corresponding statements in (2), (3) and (4), and conservation of *Curis*: (1b) and corresponding statements in (2), (3) and (4)) that should have been voted on separately. Four Commissioners split their votes such that the proposals for conservation of the name *Cisseis*, (1a) and corresponding statements in (2), (3) and (4), received a majority of the votes cast but failed to reach the required two-thirds majority (12 FOR, 10 AGAINST). The application was submitted for a second vote under Bylaw 35. On 1 March 2008 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 63: 248 (1a), (2a), (3a) and (4a) only.

At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2007 the votes were as follows: *Curis* proposals (1b), (2b), (3b) and (4b)

Affirmative votes – 10: Alonso-Zarazaga, Brothers, Fautin, Halliday, Krell, Mawatari, Papp, Patterson, van Tol and Zhang.

Negative votes – 12: Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Grygier, Kerzhner, Kottelat, Kullander, Lamas, Lim, Mahnert, Pape, Rosenberg and Štys.

No vote was received from Song. Minelli, Ng and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Voting against the proposal, Kerzhner said that no ruling was necessary as both valid and invalid names can be cited as senior homonyms; such citations are not necessarily used as valid names and do not create obstacles to the application of Article 23.9. Štys, voting against the proposal, commented that the case presented two entirely independent cases, but went on to say that admittedly they are similar and the comments included in proposals (2) and (3) concerned both of them. Kottelat also indicated that the two cases should have been voted on separately, although he voted against both cases and thus did not split his vote. Grygier also indicated that the cases should have been separated, but voted against both cases. He commented further that the argument for conservation of *Cisseis* is a little stronger than for *Curis*, but both suffer from insufficient documentation of harm that would ensue from re-adoption of the older names.

At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2008 the votes were as follows:

*Cisseis* proposals (1a), (2a), (3a) and (4a)

Affirmative votes – 7: Bogutskaya, Fautin, Halliday, Krell, Mawatari, Papp and Zhang.

Negative votes – 10: Bouchet, Brothers, Grygier, Kottelat, Kullander, Lamas, Pape, Rosenberg, Štys and van Tol.

No vote was received from Lim. Alonso-Zarazaga, Minelli, Ng, Patterson and Pyle were on leave of absence.

Grygier, voting against the proposal, commented that there is insufficient documentation of harm.

No names are placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.